Dup Fred W. Ring

FELLOWSHIP

August 1944 Vol. X—No. 8

Can North-Americans and Latin-Americans Be Friends?

By OSCAR MORINEAU

•

Help for a Hopeless People

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

•

The Project of Peace

By RALPH WALDO EMERSON

•

Tackling Jim Crow Is a Dangerous Job

By GEORGE HOUSER

How are ye blind,
Ye treaders down of cities, ye that cast
Temples to desolation, and lay waste
Tombs, the untrodden sanctuaries where lie
The ancient dead; yourselves so soon to die.

—Milton (*from Euripides*)

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

Henry W. Pinkham, writing in the *Christian Leader,* complains that pacifist ministers are not getting into enough trouble these days. The reason is, he thinks, that they are not making enough trouble. "Pacifist ministers," he writes, "are much more numerous in the present world war than in the former. Yet there are fewer cases of ministers ousted from their pastorates because of their opposition to collective homicide. The reason, I think, is not that parishes are more tolerant, but rather that ministers are more cautious."

Let it be said at once that no living clergyman has a better right to voice this complaint than Mr. Pinkham. In season and out, he has denounced this war, as he denounced the last war. His denunciations have not only been persistent but effective. He has written letters, published pamphlets, made speeches, presented resolutions to church conferences, and this last year he paraded the streets as a sandwich-man bearing posters which demanded in large letters that there be "an end to slaughter." Henry W. Pinkham has not been "cautious."

But if his complaint is sound, why has not Mr. Pinkham been interfered with? If it is undue caution that has protected his brethren, why has his boldness led to no trouble? When he walked the streets of Boston with posters fore and aft bearing the flaming slogan, "Stop This War," the public made no protest and the authorities no arrest. "My adventure," says Mr. Pinkham, "got me no nearer jail." Which shows just why other ministers who hate this war have gotten "no nearer jail," nor lost their parishes and their general repute!

I have an idea that pacifists in the pulpit are not only far more numerous in this war than in the last war, but they are also quite as outspoken. I know one man who strides about the countryside which he serves as a rural pastor, denouncing this war as the work of the devil, indicating conscription as "selective slavery," and calling unceasingly for "peace now." This man is no lonely figure. What he is doing in his dramatic fashion, hundreds of other ministers are doing in ways that match their personalities and meet their opportunities. These ministers in all parts of the country are preaching and praying for peace. They are inviting no hatred or vengeance upon the enemy, but urging rather understanding and compassion. They are keeping bond-sales out of their churches and service flags out of their sanctuaries. They are refusing to traffic in propaganda, but are speaking the truth as they find it. These pacifist ministers are by no means a majority among their fellows. All too many preachers are still presenting arms. But this pacifist minority is vocal, it stands up at religious conventions and is counted, it points the way to peace.

If these men are not persecuted as were their scattered predecessors in the last war, may it not be because they present a formidable front not lightly to be attacked? Among them are honored and influential leaders in every community in the land. Together they constitute a body of public opinion such as no previous war time government has faced. Pacifism in the churches, in the short space of a quarter of a century, has become too powerful to be banned by bishops or police.

But if pacifism were no stronger in this war than in the last war, I still believe it would be let alone. For there is a different public temper toward war today. It is a different air we breathe, a different world in which we live. Three things people have learned in the course of the most dreadful generation in human history:

(1) First, that war is vile, ugly, obscene—that there is nothing good to be said of it and everything bad. There was a time when war had glitter, glamor, and glory. Flags waved when the boys marched away. Victories were celebrated with music and wild shouts. Germany, when she had victories to celebrate in this war, sounded trumpets on the air; Russia still announces victories with loud salvos of artillery. But we have gotten beyond this barbarism. We adorn this horror with no gladness, and welcome it with no applause. On D-Day our instinctive thought was not dancing in the streets but praying in the churches. So horrible has war become! The best that we now can say of it is that there are evils that are worse. I don't know what they are, since every evil lies already wrapped in war. But this excuse puts war where it belongs—among the evils of life that the mind can no longer defend.

(2) Secondly, we have learned that war cannot be reconciled with Christianity—that the separation between these two is complete and final. Oh, there are ministers today who still plead the cause of arms in the name of God and Christ, as there were churchmen yesterday who rode into battle to vindicate the Lord. But ministers no longer delight in uniforms or seize weapons for active service at the front—this is as intolerable to their profession as dressing Christ in khaki and trench helmet. The church is no longer a belligerent force. A government may go to war, but not the church which, in fidelity to the Prince of Peace, must dwell "above the battle." Religion as an ally of war, which practises every crime and sanctifies every sin, has become impossible. And men know it!

(3) Lastly, and logically, men have learned that the pacifists are right, and have been right from the beginning. Without saying much about it, people are increasingly glad to see and hear pacifists in the pulpit, for they know that these ministers can be counted upon to preach what properly belongs to religion. Pacifists or not, themselves, they feel an instinctive comfort that they can go to their churches and hear the Gospel respected and not profaned. How beautiful, and significant, the statement of a layman to my ears: "I don't agree with you. I don't know how to go along with you. Now that we are in this mess, I don't see how we can get out of it without fighting it through to a finish. But I'm glad you think as you do, and I know that the time is coming when we shall all be proud that we had a pacifist in our pulpit during the war."

These are the reasons, my dearly beloved and deeply admired Pinkham, that pacifist ministers are not having trouble these days. The parishes *are* "more tolerant." The people are more devout. Humanity is beginning to understand our message, and to sympathize with our spirit. We are winning our fight!

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*
J. ELLIOTT FINLAY *Managing Editor*

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

August 1944 **Vol. X—No. 8**

A Mexican who has lived on both sides of the border speaks frankly about a perennial question—

Can North-Americans and Latin-Americans Be Friends?

By OSCAR MORINEAU*

ONE of the greatest tragedies in recent history is nationalistic misunderstanding. Friendship depends upon understanding, which is a combination of knowledge and sympathy. Unsympathetic knowledge does not produce understanding. And in many cases even knowledge itself is impossible without sympathy. If we feel antagonistic towards others, they will not react with their normal, spontaneous behavior, and our minds will not be able to grasp their true characteristics.

You have in your South a good example of what I mean by knowledge without sympathy. Many prominent Southerners become impatient when you bring up the subject of race prejudice. They solemnly declare that they love the real Negro and that ignorant persons from the outside invent racial intolerance. *Time* (June 19) quotes the *Granada County Weekly* editorial: "The good darkies of the South should remember that, at the best, Eleanor (Roosevelt) will be boss of the U. S. a limited time, while the good white people of the South will be here forever . . ." The friendship to which I refer in this article has nothing in common with that existing between the good darkies and the good white people of the South.

Friendship between the people of the United States and those of Latin America *is* possible. I know by personal experience. Some of my own best friends are citizens of the United States. Sincerity has been the basis of our friendship, and for this reason I do not have to apologize now for being sincere. One has no right at all to address others unless one speaks with truth. Therefore, I only beg you to be sympathetic with what I say and with the way I say it. I need your sympathy, not only because I am a Mexican, alien to you, but also because I am neither a professional writer nor a politician, and do not have the ability to cater to your vanity, your prejudices, or your love of slang.

Several obstacles hinder our friendship. One of the most serious is the suspicion that has been created by one hundred years of mistakes in our relations. The so-called protection of your foreign investments has invaded our sovereignty at various times and has prevented social intercourse. But fortunately a great change has taken place since the war and the inauguration of your Good Neighbor Policy. And we hope that there is no relation of cause and effect between the first and the second.

Another obstacle to a true understanding between our peoples has been the predominance of provincialism, especially in the United States. The war has modified this situation deeply, however, and the soldiers coming back from all parts of the world will be more tolerant and universal than many a college professor. Improved transportation facilities and increased cultural and commercial intercourse in the future will further contribute to bring us together, if we do not again allow the "good" people on both sides of the border to poison us.

That the obstacles to sympathetic understanding between countries may be removed is clear, for the basis of friendship is natural and therefore permanent and deep. Human beings feel attraction towards all manifestations of life, whether plants or animals. And in other persons we come in contact not only with life, but also with beings of our own kind. Since man is a social animal, it is possible to eradicate anti-social prejudices such as race hatred, suspicion of all alien people, and clannish provincialism. Friendship with foreigners contributes to our personal development. Contact with people who are very different from us furnishes a fresh source of variety, serves to amplify our horizons, mitigates our defects, and reaffirms our merits.

To me it is obvious that many citizens of the United States are arrogant and resent being told disagreeable things about themselves. They think their country and their way of living are the best in the world. Their attitude is such an obstacle to understanding that when visiting Latin-

* Member of a leading law firm in Mexico City, Mr. Morineau lived for some years in the United States.

American countries they generally catch only the superficial and external aspects of our life. Nevertheless, North Americans can "take it" much better than we of Latin America. After having lived for many years in the United States, I was surprised, on my return to Mexico, to discover that, as a rule, the most prominent Mexicans are exceedingly touchy. This apparently results from an inferiority complex produced by many factors, among which the most important are racial differences (not hatred or intolerance), and the privileged position of the white elements in our population during the centuries of colonial life. This touchiness on the part of gifted Latin-Americans is so extreme and harmful that I am tempted to expose it, in the hope that it will disappear like microbes when exposed to the sun.

My personal contact with the most prominent Mexicans permits me to know them. I am able to state that practically all of them are touchy and vain. A few examples will illustrate better than abstract generalizations. A few months ago a young lawyer won a case in the Supreme Court of Mexico. The counsel for the opposite party was a jurist whom I consider one of the best in our history. In spite of his greatness, as a lawyer, this prominent attorney has been wasting his time by spending hours every day among his friends, criticizing his opponent! Obviously, this attitude is very far from the sportsman's idea of being a good loser.

Another recent case is that of a brilliant economist who wrote a series of articles in one of our newspapers, against the financial policy of the Government. The fact that he did not recognize the authority of our most important monetary expert was enough to induce the latter to lock himself for several months in his house to write a book on the same subject. Very recently a well-known writer wrote an article against the President of our University, which article I consider very unfair. The President sent his representatives to challenge the writer to a duel. Some years ago one of our greatest educators and philosophers became president of the University and, although he had digested the most abstruse philosophies, his vanity had no limits while he held the job.

I could write a bookful of similar examples. But it would be a mistake to consider these persons ignorant or foolish. From the point of view of culture, intelligence, and honesty they rank among the highest in the world. But the fact remains that many of our great men become intoxicated with power, and most of them are touchy and vain. In the United States many of your prominent men also become intoxicated with power, and are arrogant and narrow-minded.

Another factor in the formation of our inferiority complex is our colonial mentality, which made us depend on European culture—especially Spanish and French—as the pattern for our values. This dependence inhibited the spontaneous development of our personality. Finally, during the past hundred years, when Latin-American tradition came in contact with Anglo-Saxon *success,* this contributed to further fix our inferiority complex.

Fortunately, this situation is disappearing rapidly, for the causes which produced it are also disappearing. The predominant type in Mexican society now is not the "criollo" nor the Indian, but the "mestizo," born from the intermarriage of white and Indian. Spain is the most important source of our cultural background, but neither Spain nor France is any longer our chief source of knowledge and inspiration. There is a great influence coming from the rest of Europe and especially from the United States. But neither the old tradition nor the new influence is accepted passively. The Mexican is now digesting these foreign influences and creating his own values.

What is the cause of this fundamental change in Latin-American mentality, and what will be its effects upon our contribution to the world of the future? Confidence in our way of living has been produced not so much by the principles which guide our behavior as by their contrast with those of Western civilization. Not only are we conscious of the failure of Western civilization to avoid social evils such as war, hatred, and oppression, but even in times of peace we feel that it does not favor the full development of personality which for us is the only meaning of liberty. It is obvious that Latin-America, in general, lacks political liberty, but we have seen that such liberty is secondary, especially if it coexists with social injustice, race hatred, and bigoted reactions on the part of large and influential sections of public opinion.

Recently I read an article written by one of the deepest thinkers in English, Mr. Bertrand Russell. It appears in *The Saturday Evening Post* (June 3). Having read most of the works of this writer, I was surprised in this article at his great ability to be trivial. *The Saturday Evening Post* has one of the largest circulations in the world. It follows that its editors know the market. But compare the standard of magazines in the United States with that of any of the daily newspapers in Latin-America. In Mexico, our greatest philosopher, Antonio Caso, writes every week on the daily *El Universal* and, although he makes use of plain and clear language, his subjects would be considered abstruse in the United States and fitted only for specialized philosophical publications. It would be inconceivable in the United States for John Dewey to take the place of the late Brisbane, for instance. This contrast, if analyzed, goes to the root of our different mentalities. Let me add another manifestation that clearly brings to light this difference. It is a rule that North Americans of great sensibility and refinement, who know us well, become permanently attached to us and many of them would prefer to stay here. On the other hand, it is a rule that Mexican workmen love to emigrate to the United States. I am able to assert that Mexico has been a step-mother for the masses. Might it not be equally true that the United States is becoming suffocating for certain select minorities who are getting fed up with a rationalized, mechanized, and materialized life?

In order to discover our differences it is necessary to compare the North and the South with respect to culture vs. civilization; women and the family; love and friendship vs. citizenship; North-American uniformity vs. Latin-American bi-polar personality. Finally, it is necessary to mention our respective merits and virtues.

If we take into account our backwardness in material development, scientific investigation, technological progress, and industrial production, and our need for social betterment through public health, communications, adequate education of the masses, and domestic comforts and conveniences, it is obvious that Mexico needs the United States. Could we also say without vanity that Rome needs Greece?

Help for a Hopeless People*

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

NOTHING in my whole Puerto Rican trip of five weeks last spring moved me more than the evening I spent with the Martin Brumbaugh unit of the CPS at Castañer. It was balm to one's soul, when so large a portion of the youth of the world is devoting all its time and risking its very existence to destroy the young and old of other countries, to find one place in which young men and young women are unselfishly devoting themselves to constructive Christian efforts for the advancement of the spiritual, the moral, and the physical welfare of the backward people of that rural insular community. I should really say "two places," for I had lunch on the same day with the Mennonite unit at La Plata, and there, too, I was deeply impressed with the absence of hate, bitterness, and talk of international murder. But my stay at La Plata was necessarily short. At Castañer I not only had the greater part of the afternoon to inspect the work of the plant and to see some of the beneficiaries of this stirring undertaking, but I had the whole evening with practically the entire unit.

Let me say at once that I learned much from these young men and women. At my request the first hour was devoted to their telling me what they thought of the Puerto Ricans and their particular problems. Rightly unmoved by the presence of my guide, Mr. A. M. De Andino, an important official of the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration, and especially concerned with the supervision of Castañer and other housing developments, they spoke out frankly as to their problems, the weaknesses and fine qualities of the Puerto Ricans, and the opportunities in the work. When so many other continental Americans are so certain of their complete superiority to the islanders and have so many adjectives to apply to them, it was a joy to find that the verdict of this group as a whole was largely favorable. They admitted that many Puerto Ricans lack a sense of responsibility, fail to understand the value of time and of being on time, and often do not fulfill their obligations. They did not, however, accept those weaknesses as innate faults of the Latin-American character. At least, so I gathered. These young people seemed able to rise above these irritations and to look upon them in the light of the Puerto Rican situation as a whole and of the desperate efforts Puerto Ricans must make to keep bodies and souls together.

There was no note of discouragement, only one of cheer and satisfaction in the work. Mr. De Andino took his part in the debate, differing at points, agreeing at others, and added much to the evening as he did to the success and the informing character of my trip in his car. Here I must tell the readers of FELLOWSHIP that he, like all the other Puerto Rican and continental American officials I met, was most enthusiastic about the work of the COs and their associates in the Brumbaugh unit. In an official report Mr. De Andino speaks thus of its work: "This splendid educational health and hospital program on a service basis, which is rendering valuable services to the under-privileged classes of some of our rural districts, is being developed very successfully," with the cooperation, he adds, of the National Selective Service and the Insular Health Department.

Like every other visitor, I am sure, I was immensely impressed by the 25-bed hospital now in its second year of service under the guidance of Dr. Daryl Parker, and which, by the way, is being steadily enlarged mostly by the staff and the members of the unit. They are literally building this hospital themselves. I have had some experience in hospital management and it took me no time to sense the high professional standards with which the work is being carried on with such very limited means and equipment—often secondhand, antiquated equipment which any up-to-date North American hospital would scorn. As for Dr. Parker himself, it suffices to tell that he recently was complimented by being asked to become chief surgeon of the leading San Juan hospital, but he at once rejected this valuable professional opportunity in order to continue his pioneering work at Castañer, both in the hospital and in the clinic. The example of the latter has already led to the establishment of others in near-by communities. Nothing could, I think, typify better the true spirit of the medical man, the nurses and the COs in the whole undertaking than Dr. Parker's refusal of this offer. He is a remarkable man.

Mr. Rufus B. King is director of the unit, which is undertaking an ambitious program of medical, agricultural, educational, and social reconstruction, and doing it with notable efficiency, tolerance, and Christian sympathy and understanding. At Castañer, the work of the unit owes much to its head, Herman Will, Jr., and to Mrs. Will, who has a perfect command of Spanish. There are now five such projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—the one on St. Croix, V. I., was not yet fully established when I was there, and so I saw only the quarters it is now occupying. Everywhere the need and the opportunity are pressing—the need to give of oneself freely, generously, happily to aid people whose condition constantly reflects discredit, and in Puerto Rico increasing discredit, upon all of us continental Americans and upon the flag of our country.

When my precious evening at Castañer had come to an end a most illuminating incident occurred. One of the COs came up to me as I was leaving, and said that he had a theory about the Puerto Ricans which he had hesitated to offer before the group. He said that this was the first time he had been out of the continental United States; that he came from a Southwestern state in which sometimes there were only twelve families to a township; and that he thought he knew what was wrong with the Puerto Ricans. They are, he said, "a lonely people." I replied: "A lonely people? Why don't you know that this island has nearly

* The Martin G. Brumbaugh Reconstruction Unit, with headquarters in Puerto Rico, otherwise known as CPS No. 43, was established in August, 1942, at Castañer, with 11 CPS men, two doctors, and a nurse, all under the direction of the Church of the Brethren. The work proved so valuable that the program has since been expanded to include two similar projects at La Plata (Mennonite) and Zalduondo (Friends) and two others in the Virgin Islands,—one under the Brethren at St. Thomas, and one under the Friends at St. Croix. When the five units are fully developed they will use a total of 75 CPS men together with a number of non-CPS doctors, nurses, social workers, and others. In addition to building local hospitals, each unit carries on an extensive community program involving medical, educational, social, and recreational work. The director of the Castañer project is Herman Will, Jr., former Midwest Secretary of the FOR.

400 people to the square mile and is one of the four or five most densely populated places on earth?" "Yes," he answered, "I know all that. But when you go to call on them they are just so grateful that they offer you their last drop of wine, their last bit of food." "That," I rejoined, "is the Spanish spirit and habit." But he insisted there is something more to it than that; he was convinced that they are suffering complete spiritual and moral loneliness and hopelessness, a condition not mitigated by any propinquity with similarly situated human beings.

A few days later I was talking with three high officials of the Insular Health Department. I told them of this young man's opinion and asked if they thought it was correct. To my astonishment they heartily agreed. I asked why. After a moment's pause the woman official in front of me burst into tears. The Deputy Health Commissioner, to cover her embarrassment, said: "Why should they *not* be lonely? They have nothing to look forward to, no hope in life, nothing that they can achieve. They cannot hope to advance their children, they have no education, they cannot read or write. They are in this world but not part of it. All they can hope to do is to keep body and soul together. Life offers nothing else. Wouldn't *you* be lonely for contacts with the real world?"

By that time his woman colleague had recovered herself sufficiently to ask me if I knew that the second contributing cause of death among girls 15 to 19, and among males 26 to 34 is *suicide*. Yes, this is actually true, and under the American flag! Of course I had no idea of it and was as deeply shocked by it as everybody must be who reads these words. Suicide comes next after tuberculosis as a cause of death in this little colony of ours, and yet we boast of the high American standard of living and of the prosperity and happiness of all Americans. It is hardly any wonder that the workers at Castañer, and in the other CPS camps in Puerto Rico, find their work not only appealing but absolutely necessary.

Under these circumstances the folly of the United States Government—to give it no stronger name—in imprisoning so many COs stands out in clearer and clearer relief. If it were an intelligent Government and a really Christian one, it would be sending all COs to Puerto Rico and other plague spots under the American flag. Then we should be able to say that in at least one aspect this war was of benefit to the American people. But "the law must be obeyed and upheld"—"the authority of the Government shall not be defied"—and so the wastage of precious life and of human values goes on. Let us therefore take all the more satisfaction in the splendid achievements of the COs in Puerto Rico and their non-CO cooperators and leaders, and in the testimony they are bearing to the power of unselfish devotion to the welfare of other human beings.

The Project of Peace*

By RALPH WALDO EMERSON

THAT the project of peace should appear visionary to great numbers of sensible men; should appear laughable even, to numbers; should appear to the grave and good-natured to be embarrassed with extreme practical difficulties—is very natural. "This is a poor, tedious society of yours," they say: "we do not see what good can come of it. . . . If a foreign nation should wantonly insult or plunder our commerce, or, worse yet, should land on our shores to rob and kill, you would not have us sit, and be robbed and killed? You mistake the times; you over-estimate the virtue of men. You forget that the quiet which now sleeps in cities and in farms, which lets the wagon go unguarded and the farmhouse unbolted, rests on the perfect understanding of all men that the musket, the halter, and the jail stand behind there, ready to punish any disturber of it. All admit that this would be the best policy, if the world were a church, if all men were the best men, if all would agree to accept this rule. But it is absurd for one nation to attempt it alone."

In the first place, we answer that we never make much account of objections which merely respect the actual state of the world at this moment, but which admit the general expediency and permanent excellence of the project. What is the best must be the true; and what is true,—that is, what is at bottom fit and agreeable to the constitution of man,—must at last prevail over all obstruction and all opposition. There is no good now enjoyed by society that was not once as problematical and visionary as this. It is the tendency of the true interest of man to become his desire and steadfast aim.

But, further, it is a lesson which all history teaches wise men, to put trust in ideas, and not in circumstances. We have all grown up in the sight of frigates and navy yards, of armed forts and islands, of arsenals and militia. The reference to any foreign register will inform us of the number of thousand or million men that are now under arms in the vast colonial system of the British empire, of Russia, Austria, and France; and one is scared to find at what cost the peace of the globe is kept. This vast apparatus of artillery, of fleets, of stone bastions and trenches and embankments; this incessant patrolling of sentinels; this waving of national flags; this reveille and evening gun; this martial music and endless playing of marches and singing; military and naval songs seem to us to constitute an imposing actual, which will not yield in centuries to the feeble, deprecatory voices of a handful of friends of peace.

Thus always are we daunted by the appearances; not seeing that their whole value lies at bottom in the state of mind. It is really a thought that built this portentous war-establishment, and a thought shall also melt it away. Every nation and every man instantly surround themselves with a material apparatus which exactly corresponds to their moral state, or their state of thought. . . . We surround ourselves always, according to our freedom and ability, with true images of ourselves in things, whether it be ships or books or cannons or churches. The standing army, the arsenal, the camp and the gibbet do not appertain to man. They only serve as an index to show where man is now;

* Extracts from a speech on "War," by Ralph Waldo Emerson, delivered in Boston, Massachusetts, in March, 1838.

what a bad, ungoverned temper he has; what an ugly neighbour he is; how his affections halt; how low his hope lies. . . .

It follows, of course, that the least change in the man will change his circumstances; the least enlargement of his ideas, the least mitigation of his feelings in respect to other men; if, for example, he could be inspired with a tender kindness to the souls of men, and should come to feel that every man was another self with whom he might come to join, as left hand works with right. Every degree of the ascendancy of this feeling would cause the most striking changes of external things: the tents would be struck; the men-of-war would rot ashore; the arms rust; the cannon would become street-posts. . . .

War and peace thus resolve themselves into a mercury [thermometer] of the stage of cultivation. At a certain stage of his progress, the man fights, if he be of a sound body and mind. At a certain higher stage, he makes no offensive demonstration, but is alert to repel injury, and of an unconquerable heart. At a still higher stage, he comes into the region of holiness; passion has passed away from him; his warlike nature is all converted into an active medicinal principle; he sacrifices himself, and accepts with alacrity wearisome tasks of denial and charity; but, being attacked, he bears it and turns the other cheek, as one engaged, throughout his being, no longer to the service of an individual but to the common soul of all men.

Since the peace question has been before the public mind, those who affirm its right and expediency have naturally been met with objections more or less weighty. There are cases frequently put by the curious—moral problems. . . . And chiefly it is said—Either accept this principle for better, for worse, carry it out to the end, and meet its absurd consequences; or else, if you pretend to set an arbitrary limit, a "Thus far, and no farther," then give up the principle, and take that limit which the common-sense of all mankind has set, and which distinguishes offensive war as criminal, defensive war as just. Otherwise, if you go for no war, then be consistent, and give up self-defense in the highway, in your own home. Will you push it thus far? Will you stick to your principle of non-resistance when your strong-box is broken open, when your wife and babes are insulted and slaughtered in your sight? If you say yes, you only invite the robber and assassin; and a few bloody-minded desperadoes would soon butcher the good.

In reply to this charge of absurdity on the extreme peace doctrine, as shown in the supposed consequences, I wish to say that such deductions consider only one half of the fact. They look only at the passive side of the friend of peace, only at his passivity; they quite omit to consider his activity. But no man, it may be presumed, ever embraced the cause of peace and philanthropy for the sole end and purpose of being plundered and slain. A man does not come the length of the spirit of martyrdom without some active purpose, some equal motive, some flaming love. If you have a nation of men who have risen to that height of moral cultivation that they will not declare war or carry arms, for they have not so much madness left in their brains, you have a nation of lovers, of benefactors, of true, great, and able men. Let me know more of that nation; I shall not find them defenceless, with idle hands springing at their sides. I shall find them men of love, honour and truth; men of an immense industry; men whose influence is felt to the end of the earth; men whose very look and voice carry the sentence of honour and shame; and all forces yield to their energy and persuasion. Whenever we see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, we may be assured it will not be one that invites injury; but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the bottom of the heart of every man, even of the violent and the base; one against which no weapon can prosper; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race and has the tears and the blessings of mankind.

In the second place, as far as it respects individual action in difficult and extreme cases, I will say, such cases seldom or never occur to the good and just man; nor are we careful to say, or even to know, what in such crises is to be done. A wise man will never impawn his future being and action, and decide beforehand what he shall do in a given extreme event. Nature and God will instruct him in that hour. . . .

The cause of peace is not the cause of cowardice. If peace is sought to be defended or preserved for the safety of the luxurious and the timid, it is a sham, and the peace will be base. War is better, and the peace will be broken. If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero, namely, the will to carry their life in their hand, and stake it at any instant for their principle, but who have gone one step beyond the hero, and will not seek another man's life; men who have, by their intellectual insight or else by their moral elevation, attained such a perception of their own intrinsic worth, that they do not think property or their own body a sufficient good to be saved by such dereliction of principle as treating a man like a sheep. . . . Nor . . . is the peace principle to be carried into effect by fear. It can never be defended, it can never be executed, by cowards. Everything great must be done in the spirit of greatness. The manhood that has been in war must be transferred to the cause of peace, before war can lose its charm, and peace be venerable to men.

The question naturally arises, How is this new aspiration of the human mind to be made visible and real? How is it to pass out of thoughts into things?

Not, certainly, in the first place, *in the way of routine and mere forms*—the universal specific of modern politics; not by organising a society, and going through a course of resolutions and public manifestoes, and being thus formally accredited to the public and to the civility of the newspapers. We have played this game to tediousness. . . . Men who love that bloated vanity called public opinion think all is well if they have once got their bantling through a sufficient course of speeches and cheerings, of one, two, or three public meetings; as if *they* could do anything: they vote and vote, cry hurrah on both sides, no man responsible, no man caring a pin. . . .

This is not to be carried by public opinion, but by private opinion, by private conviction, by private, dear, and earnest love. For the only hope of this cause is in the increased insight, and it is to be accomplished by the spontaneous teaching, of the cultivated soul, in its secret experience and meditation—that it is now time that it should pass out of the state of beast into the state of man; it is to hear the voice of God, which bids the devils that have rended and torn him, come out of him and let him now be clothed and walk forth in his right mind.

Six interracial crusaders in Cleveland learned through actual experience that—

Tackling Jim Crow Is a Dangerous Job

By GEORGE M. HOUSER*

HERE is a story about six pacifists in a project of non-violent direct action. But it is not the kind of success story that pacifists like to hear. This project apparently was a failure, and I hesitated to put the story in writing, but I have decided to give the main outlines of the experience because it is important for others who are tackling the race problem to realize that they are playing with dynamite.

For those who optimistically predict that the race problem will solve itself, this experience should reveal the deep intensity of the problem. For persons who feel that to do anything about the race problem is simply to make it worse, this experience should reveal that the situation demands immediate action. For persons and groups practicing non-violent direct action techniques against racism, it should show that no easy success is possible, and that race riots may easily result from a tension situation.

It happened in Cleveland in May, 1944. A small interracial group composed of FOR members, young members of the Society of Friends, and youth members of the NAACP, was engaged in action projects to challenge Jim Crow in public places by non-violent techniques. I arrived in the city when this group was in the midst of a campaign against a Euclid Avenue roller skating rink. Three times previously several white youths and one colored girl had gone to the rink. On each occasion they had been permitted to buy tickets and had entered the rink. Once they had skated for a short while, only to be called into the owner's office and told that they were simply pouring fuel on race riot flames. The members of the group explained, however, that they were trying to introduce the interracial factor gradually into the rink so that the young people who regularly attended would become accustomed to skating in the same rink with colored people.

Again a group was formed to go skating. There were six of us—two colored girls, two white fellows, and two white girls. We gained entrance to the rink without difficulty—tickets were sold as usual, except that the ticket seller made an emergency phone call as soon as she had sold tickets to the Negro girls. Once on the inside, the discrimination began. The young man responsible for handing out the skates would not give us skates of the size we asked for. If we asked for size eight, we were given fives. If we asked for fives, we were given twos. I finally managed to get a size that, although small, would fit me; but two of the girls, one white and one colored, never did get a size they could wear. One of the colored girls had brought her own skates, so that was no problem for her. During this period some of the other skaters began to notice us. We were made conspicuous by having to return again and again to ask for the right size skates.

Four of us finally began skating. A few of the other skaters soon began trying to trip the colored member of our group, in spite of the fact that she was a girl. When we drew up to the side during an intermission to discuss the situation, the one creative event of the evening took place. We started a conversation with a girl who had been staying close to us ever since we had entered the rink. She drew me aside and said, "You know why it is they won't give skates to your other friends? This is a Jim Crow rink. I've just protested to the uniformed man over there." Then she explained that she was from West Virginia, but had long since overcome her prejudice. In fact, she said that she was now the only white person employed in a certain part of a smelting company, and she gave me the names of several Negro contacts in the CIO union in her plant.

After I had been talking with this new-found friend for several minutes, I looked towards the far side of the rink and discovered that the two colored members of our group were surrounded by a number of white skaters. I approached the small group in a hurry and drew up just in time to hear one of the white girls say: "Why don't you go to your own skating rink?" I raised the question: "You mean you don't allow all persons in here?" The response came back from many of the girls at once: "No, we don't want *them* here. They have their own rink."

By this time our small group had become a large one. More than a hundred were crowded around us. Some of the members of this crowd had questioning expressions on their faces. But as I seized this opportunity to say a few words about the meaning of democracy in regard to race, many faces showed obvious disgust or even anger. One fellow said, "I don't know where you come from, but it's different here in Cleveland." No one seemed to be on the rink any longer. Everyone was huddled into this one compact group at one end of the large building. But the management of the rink must have become alarmed, for the uniformed floor-men jostled their way through the crowd, telling everyone to scatter and "break it up." This effectively ended our first encounter with the crowd.

One tall, good-looking young man, who could not have been over twenty years of age, attracted my attention by his bitter denunciation and half-threats against me, and I took advantage of the scattering of the group to approach him. I asked him if he would be willing to talk for a few minutes. He indicated his assent, half grudgingly. We sat down on a couple of seats close by to continue our discussion of race and its relation to democracy and Christianity. I asked him if he were a Christian, and he said that he was. When I asked him if his religion did not demand of him that he practice love toward all men, regardless of race or nation, he replied in a disturbed manner: "I don't take my religion that far."

Had we been able to continue our conversations privately, I believe we would have made some progress, but soon others began to gather around us and he put on a tough air. Then members of the crowd began to taunt me, asking me to step outside for a minute, or telling me never to step inside this place again or I would be sorry. And, as al-

*FOR's Action Projects Secretary, in Cleveland, Ohio, and formerly Secretary of the Chicago FOR.

ways, someone asked, "Would you marry one of *them?*" I answered the question as squarely and as briefly as I could by saying I certainly believed in the right of inter-marriage. That seemed to be the last straw. Everyone was denouncing me at once as a "traitor of the white race," as "too cheap to associate with," and as a "nigger-lover." I decided I had better say no more, since the gathering was hardly in a frame of mind to discuss the matter rationally.

At this moment the owner of the rink pushed his way through the crowd and said that he wanted to see us in his office immediately. We followed him to his office and there he gave us a terrific scolding. He called us "instigators of race riots" and "young idealists who don't know anything about the race problem" and "don't know what you're doing." He had been nice to us thus far, he said, but from now on he would not allow any of us in the rink. He was not going to have any murder committed in his rink, or have any scandal get into the headlines of the papers.

He must have shouted at us for half an hour before we could get in a word edgewise. The we assured him we did not wish to cause him any trouble, but that we would like to work out some technique with him whereby we might be able to educate the skaters who came to his rink. Could we meet with the leaders of the skaters in any way? Could we do anything within the roller clubs which had regular skating hours and meetings? We met with no success in our attempts to work out a creative next step with him. But he was not interested in our concern. He was interested only in his business. The race problem might be solved sometime, but not for hundreds of years, and there was nothing we could do now, he told us.

By now it was closing time, and the skaters had started to leave the rink. Then word was brought to the office by one of the uniformed floor-men that a large gang of boys was waiting for us outside, and that they didn't want the girls in our group—just the two fellows. The owner of the rink was afraid, and blamed us completely for the predicament which he felt we had put him in. (It should be stated parenthetically here that the feeling on the part of the other skaters never would have arisen to the height it did if this feeling had not been fanned by various persons connected with the management of the rink. One of our small group had seen the cashier and others of the rink personnel speaking to gang leaders from time to time, earlier in the evening. It was these leaders who instigated the trouble after being urged. It has been true in my experience that in any public place the management can largely control any racial disturbance by a firm attitude favoring equal treatment of races. The owner of this rink had laid foundations for our experience more than a year previously when he built a segregated rink for Negroes. He owns both of the rinks.)

We decided to stay inside of the building for a while to see whether the gang outside would melt away. The side exits of the rink were blocked by automobiles, and the large group waited in front. The owner did not want to call the police because that would give his place a police record. We did not wish to call the police either. So we waited—for an hour. At midnight the owner finally left in his car. Some of the members of our group had to get up at five o'clock in the morning, and so we decided we would have to leave, too. Accompanied by two of the rink personnel, we went out a side entrance that was no longer blocked, made our way to the street, and there caught a street car. We were not surprised to note, a few minutes later, that at least two loaded cars were following our street car. Consequently we decided to ride to the public square, go into a drug store, and there await the gang, hoping that by a face-to-face contact we would be able to talk with those who were so bent on having our blood.

When we left the street car at the square the automobiles stopped and their occupants got out and followed us. There were about two dozen fellows, some of them of high school age, and a few girls. Half way across the square, almost vacant at this time of night, we stopped, turned, and faced them. "What do you want?" I asked them. "Come around the block with us," said the large, tough-looking leader of the gang.

"And what do you think you will gain by beating us up?" I asked.

"We'll get our satisfaction," came the reply. "We don't want people like you in Cleveland. We don't want any nigger-lovers here. We're going to ship you back to Chicago in a box. Are you afraid to fight?" he ended.

I assured him that I was not afraid, but that I did not believe in fighting. Increasingly it seemed to me that the only way to deal with the problem was to go with the group and let them do what they wanted. But the girls in our group advised that it would be foolhardy. So we proceeded to the lobby of a near-by hotel, followed by the gang. "You can't get away from us," they said. "We'll wait all night for you if we have to."

In the almost empty hotel lobby the gang continued their threats, and we discussed our next step. Not seeing any creativity for anyone in allowing ourselves to get caught in an obscure and dark corner of Cleveland, we decided to sit it out in the hotel. But the leader of the gang was not eager to have it so. He directed several threats at me and then shifted his attention to my male companion. Some of the boys in the gang were getting their fill of this. They approached the leader and urged him to "come on and get out of here." He was not to be easily drawn away, however. He began to twist my companion's arm, and it began to look as though the climax of the evening were here. But just at this moment the hotel detective arrived on the scene. I did not know until later that one of the girls had asked him to intervene. After showing his badge he ushered the gang out of the hotel. Three of them later stole in again and sat down on the far side of the lobby.

The rest of the experience was anti-climactic. The detective called a police car, and the siren must have scared the gang away, for when we went out on the square a few minutes later no one was in sight. We hailed a taxi and, one by one, were taken to our homes.

We will not drop the case of the roller rink. However, we will be unusually careful in planning and executing our next steps. It may be that the beating which we escaped on this occasion lies ahead of us. We do not wish to escape the punishment which may come upon us for practicing what we know to be the truth, but on the other hand, we do not see the way of non-violence as demanding that we seek out this punishment. We pray that Jim Crow may be fought without violence, but if that is impossible we pray that we may be able to absorb the violence in the spirit of redemptive love.

Here Is What Others Say About

Peacetime Conscription

The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association

The American Association of School Administrators

The Problems and Plans Committee of the American Council on Education

In our judgment it is unwise to commit the nation at this time to a year of universal military service for the following reasons:

(1) *Present military necessity*—Under the Selective Service Act, the present personnel needs of the Armed Forces are being met so far as the nation's resources of manpower permit. It therefore follows that the proposed year of compulsory military service is to be conceived in terms of a post-war, not a current, undertaking. No basic change in the present Selective Service System is necessary to provide required military personnel, not only for the period of the war, but also for the period immediately following the defeat of our enemies.

(2) *Longtime military necessity*—Since the proposed year of compulsory military service is not a question of immediate military necessity, it must be appraised in long range terms. In these terms, it is clearly impossible at this time to debate fairly and intelligently the question of whether compulsory military service is a national military necessity. No one can foresee the international situation which will exist when Germany and Japan are defeated. Neither the international political nor the international military situation can be calculated while the war is still in progress. Prophecies on this subject and debate thereon at this time may prove detrimental to sound national policy and to the unity of the United Nations.

(3) *Policing the peace*—When this war is over, it may be necessary to maintain a large standing army to police the peace, and this may force us to adopt compulsory military training. No one is in a position now, however, to forecast fully the international responsibilities that relate to the occupation of foreign territories. Until the post-war national situation is clarified, it seems to us extremely unwise and even dangerous to commit the nation to such a revolutionary change in fundamental national policy as would the establishment of compulsory military service.

(4) *The American Military Tradition*—Our American democratic tradition is strongly set against a large standing army. We, along with the great body of Americans, will support a year of compulsory military service when we are convinced that the safety of the nation requires it. We are unreservedly for adequate preparedness, but we see great dangers in any unnecessary break with our tested democratic tradition respecting compulsory military service in times of peace.

(5) *The opinion of the young men now fighting the war*—The year of proposed military service, if adopted will directly affect the children of men who are now fighting in the armed forces. These men should have a voice in determining the desirability and soundness of compulsory military service. Their opinions cannot, however, be determined until the war is over. This constitutes another strong reason for delaying decision until peace has come.

(6) *The nature of the peace*—The American people are fighting this war with the high hope that it will eventuate in an enduring peace. We all look for measures of international cooperation which will reduce the necessity for post-war large scale military establishments. If, against the background of these great expectations, a year of compulsory military training is urged, many Americans will interpret such action as a signal for the return of the cynicism of the 1920's or an admission that we shall all continue to live in an armed camp and that the hopes of a more peaceful world are not to be realized. —(March 13, 1944)

The General Conference of the Methodist Church

We request Congress to postpone action on legislation involving post-war conscription until after the war.—(May 6, 1944)

The Northern Baptist Convention

Whereas, our people are now engaged in a great war which has aroused their feelings and passions to such an extent as to render sober and impartial thought difficult: and

Whereas, it has been proposed that the nation adopt at this time a very marked departure from its long established tradition by approving legislation which would require compulsory peacetime military training:

Whereas, the adoption of such a proposal would possibly commit our nation to a military policy which would further complicate the peaceful and cooperative solution of post-war plans for preserving peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, that we urge that the consideration of this proposal be postponed until after the end of hostilities in order that the full implications may be coolly and dispassionately considered and until a national referendum may be held. —(May 26, 1944)

The Presbyterian General Assembly

We would record our conviction that no decision should be made during the war which commits this nation to a post-war policy of peacetime military conscription.—(May 30, 1944)

The Annual Conference of the Church of the Brethren

The great principles of equal opportunity, freedom of thought and expression and respect for the views and rights of minorities—principles originating in the spirit of Christ, and expressed in modern democracy—are also in peril. While we rejoice in the degree to which our government continues to maintain them, we cannot be blind to the fact that they are violated occasionally by the government itself and more frequently by the citizenry. We regard with sorrow and alarm the increasing antagonism directed against Jews, Negroes, Mexicans, and American Japanese; and the current effort toward permanent regimentation and militarization of American life through such proposals as the May Conscription Bill.—(June 11, 1944)

The United Council of Church Women

Believing peacetime conscription to be opposed to principles both of the democratic way of life and the Christian belief in the worth and dignity of the individual, and believing that all young people should have an adequate opportunity to complete their education, we urge that Congress take no action looking toward the peacetime conscription of youth.—(June 16, 1944)

The Board of Trustees of the National Child Labor Committee

The National Child Labor Committee believes that the adoption of compulsory military training for young men under the age of 19 would affect profoundly the lives of our young people, and should not be entered into hastily. It believes that it is impossible to determine now, while we are in the midst of war, whether universal military training will be necessary to maintain peace and security after the war, and that until the post-war international situation is clarified, this country should not depart from its tradition which has always opposed conscription of youth in times of peace.

It therefore opposes action by Congress at the present time on bills providing for post-war compulsory military training.

The National Child Labor Committee also believes that, before action is taken by Congress on this issue which will affect every American home, there should be an opportunity for citizen groups throughout the country, including men now in military service, to debate the question. It urges that the public schools be used as meeting places where young people and adults may discuss this matter, from all angles, formulate their opinions, and express them to their elected representatives.—(May, 1944)

The United States Student Assembly

We oppose universal military conscription in peacetime.—(May 7, 1944)

The Post-War World Council

The Post-War World Council records its opposition to pending legislation providing for compulsory, peacetime, military training and service on the following grounds:

(1) Post-war conscription will make war economy a permanency. It is one way of evading the responsibility of this country's taking the necessary long-term and constructive measures to harness our productive capacity for the destruction of poverty. Its acceptance means the substitution of a military and armament economy for one that is democratically controlled. Its maintenance means production of guns, tanks, military clothes, and equipment instead of houses, schools, hospitals, and food. It spells defeat for an expanding economy of abundance.

(2) Enactment of post-war conscription means we are admitting now, while we still fight, that we have failed to keep our promise of a brave new world. We serve notice on the world that our faith in the post-war period rests, not on international collaboration, but on our own military might. It means that we are preparing the blueprint for imperialist adventure and for the next war to protest that imperialism.

(3) Acceptance of post-war conscription means retrogression of educational freedom. Our schools and colleges will have to be geared to creating an adaptability to blind obedience and rigid discipline rather than education for democracy.

(4) Post-war conscription means the forging of a powerful weapon against free labor. History has proven that military conscription has been used in other countries to break strikes by calling strikers to arms. There are powerful and articulate groups in the United States that would welcome so convenient of a method of throttling trade union activity.

(5) Compulsory military training and service would more deeply imbed into the pattern of our society the racial discrimination so characteristic of the military caste system. The well-known Jim Crow pattern of the armed forces will influence every boy who lives under its conditions for a period during his formative years immediately after high school.

(6) This country's adoption of peacetime military conscription for the third time in its history will mean our falling back into the vices of the European military psychology which we have always deprecated and looked down upon. The United States has long prided itself upon the fact that we offered a refuge to those who fled the obligation of military conscript service in the benighted countries of Europe which labored under this handicap.—(July 14, 1944)

[Editor's Note: The above statements on peacetime conscription will be available in leaflet form for wide distribution soon.]

Canadian FOR Conference Marks Considerable Progress

By A. J. MUSTE

A visit to the annual conference of the Canadian Fellowship of Reconciliation, the first held there since the beginning of the war, and an additional week's stay in Toronto, have been an exhilarating and encouraging experience, which I wish our members in the United States might have shared.

The Canadian FOR was inactive at the beginning of the war, but a couple of years ago courageous and lovable spirits such as J. Lavell Smith, Fellowship Chairman, James M. Finlay, minister of Carlton Street United Church, Claire Oké, of Fort Hope United Church, and others, began the work of rebuilding. A little less than a year ago they found in Albert G. Watson, a student at the University of Toronto, discharged from alternative service for reasons of health, a part-time secretary. Since May 1, 1944, he has been on full time.

My enthusiasm for "Ab" Watson is quite unbounded. He is mature beyond his years. He has had close contacts with both secular and religous movements, has a clear and deeply-grounded religious faith, is aware of contemporary currents of thought and action, and keen in his evaluation of them. He has also unusual organizing abilities. He and the older leaders have evidently great respect and affection for each other and work together spendidly. One has the feeling that with such a set-up the big job the FOR has still to do in Canada, will get done.

The conference was held July 7-9 at one of the famous churches of Toronto, Carlton Street United Church. The opening address given by Dr. George Tatham, associate professor of geography at the University of Toronto, a member of the Toronto Civil Liberties Association and of the FOR National Council, was a most helpful analysis of the present world situation against a background of world history.

I had been asked to deliver the next address on "The Role of the Pacifist Movement in the Present World Situation," and at the evening session on July 7, I spoke on the "Post-War Economic Outlook," with special emphasis on trends in the United States. Another prominent member of the Canadian Fellowship, Rev. E. H. Toye, spoke on "Economic Problems in Canada." He is one of several pacifist ministers who lost their pulpits in the early days of the war. He is now executive secretary of the Canadian Religion and Labour Foundation, and is concerned not only with interpreting the problems of labor to the churches, but also with infusing a religious spirit into the labor movement.

Canadian FOR people have better contacts with the leadership in the labor movement than we do on this side of the border. This is perhaps largely due to the existence of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, a progressive and socialist party, which constitutes a sort of bridge between the trade union movement and liberals and progressives generally, and which provides a channel for the activities of professional people and intellectuals, such as we do not at present have in the United States. It is important in this connection to remember that the father of the CCF, J. S. Woodworth, was a minister and a lifelong pacifist.

An active supporter of the Canadian Religion and Labour Foundation is C. H. Millard, the head of the Canadian Steelworkers Union and a CCF member of the provincial legislature of Ontario. He is a man of vision and strong religious faith. Proabbly he is not typical of the entire trade union leadership of Canada; yet it is significant that there should be such a personality in a position of such strategic importance.

On Saturday morning, July 8, the business session of the conference was held. The total of full-time and part-time enrollments was 118. In spite of the difficulties of travel, members were present from the martime provinces in the east, and even from British Columbia on the West Coast. After the business session there came round tables dealing with post-war reconstruction, labor, cooperatives, race relations, rehabilitation, "Save the Children," and refugees.

The closing address of the conference proper by James M. Finlay on "Unconditional Surrender"—of the soul of man to the leading of the Divine Spirit—greatly inspired the whole conference.

On Sunday I preached at the regular morning and evening services in Carlton Street Church as the guest of Mr. Finlay and his congregation.

The high spot of the week which followed the conference was a supper with a group of Fellowship young people followed by two or three hours of talk about the philosophy and practice of the pacifist cell. The feeling I have had in recent months that we must proceed much more systematically and on a larger scale in the development of cells, that is, an action program based on worship, was intensified by this discussion.

This trip has convinced me that it must become a habit for Fellowship folk of Canada and the United States to cross the border. We have, with our greater members and general strength, much to give to the Canadian Fellowship; but there is also much that they can teach us. "Bless be the tie that binds."

News from the Peace Front

FOR Work Abroad Goes on Under Difficulties

Europe

Siegmund Schultze, writing from Switzerland in May says, "Here in the middle of European destruction a message of fellowship means more than ever before. Friends of peace generally are being disheartened. One cannot expect much activity from refugees, who are in this country without work and still under the pressure of danger. But also the citizens of this country who have been members of peace societies are depressed by the general situation and in consequence not ready for any action. Perhaps a little change has come in this respect during the last year. Our initiative of the Summer Conference has had some effect in various groups which are working now for reconstruction. . . . The correspondence with friends in other countries of course is much checked, but I am continuing exchange with many of our friends. . . . From the Scandinavian friends I hear through the Swedish, who are as loyal as ever to our cause. They have sent beyond their yearly contributions of some hundred crowns, two payments of 2,000 crowns." This letter also brought word of the safe arrival of $2,000 from the War Victim's Fund of the Fellowship in the U. S., and that it had been principally used to meet urgent needs and works of FOR members. A cablegram, received just before going to press, said: "Work increasing. Decisions approaching for real peace. Praying."

Pierre Ceresole's *International Voluntary Service for Peace,* which organized meals for 100,000 children a day in Madrid and Valencia during the Spanish Civil War, is now appealing in England for £10,000 for "Foreign Service" and this appeal has been endorsed by The Council of British Societies for Relief Abroad. It hopes to put 50 volunteer workers into the field shortly and a first unit of 15 volunteers has been sent to the Near East to do relief work among refugees from the Balkans under the auspices of UNRRA.

Professor Heering, author of *The Fall of Christianity,* is still alive and working, as are his other friends in Holland. Henri Roser and his family continue to live in Paris and he is permitted to keep up his pastoral work. His wife is better than before and their children have benefited by a visit to Switzerland. The FOR Children's Home at Le Chambon was closed the end of last year, owing to lack of workers. But through the Swiss Red Cross, and in various ways, the children are being cared for. The French *Secours Quaker,* goes on with its relief work in Paris and elsewhere. Since the American Friends had to leave Southern France, it has taken over their whole relief program in that region, including child feeding, children's homes, distribution of clothing, etc. The Marseilles Quaker Relief reported that it helped 7,860 children and allocated 21,205 articles of clothing. Bales of clothing have reached Spain from the AFSC, and were distributed to people in Madrid and Barcelona and to men in camps and prisons.

We have very little news about pacifists in Germany, but a letter dated December 7, says that the Quaker Berlin Center was still there. We understand that a well known rural pastor continues in his village church. Church life is said to be greatly handicapped by the lack of pastors. Replacements are practically impossible because there are only a few dozen new students a year. A great many pastors have died during the war; quite a number are still in concentration camps. The theological schools are nearly closed down. Many parishes are without a pastor, but there is a great endeavor to develop lay pastorship. A new difficulty has come to the church through the heavy bombardments of the big cities. Millions of people have been displaced and scattered all over the country, and the small Christian communities are mostly dispersed and often have no leadership at all. There is a great endeavor to keep them together and to strengthen their morale. Several scattered parishes have set up a work-team of laymen to carry on part of the duties of their missing pastor.

The Hon. Secretary of the Anglo-Polish Church Fellowship writes, "Today the Churches of Poland, in common with their brethren of many lands, are passing through the valley of the shadow, but amidst the darkness of universal suffering the light of their steadfast faith and unwavering resolution shines as a torch before our eyes, leading us forward to the dawn of a new day. If we would prove ourselves worthy of their heroism and endurance our victory must be spiritual as well as physical. Ours is the task of building a new world worthy of their sacrifice and faith. Let us go forward then in the spirit of brotherhood, taking as the cornerstone of our endeavor that overflowing good will to all men which was, and is, the only hope of the world."

Word from Swedish missionaries in Romania tells of the horrible plight of the Jewish refugees deported from Romania to Ukraine, now fleeing back, hoping to escape the new front. More than 7,000 crossed the front near the Norwegian mission stations, "many of them absolutely naked, without any kind of clothes, and others in rags and barefoot, living skeletons" (letter of Feb. 15, 1944).

Britain

The British FOR has issued 3 pamphlets in connection with its Campaign for a Christian Peace dealing with the cultural, political, and economic objectives. Fellowship members are urged to "most seriously, immediately and determinedly adopt and carry through the 'cell method' of campaigning." The Council of Christian Pacifist Groups has been reorganized, taking as its new name, The Pacifist Council of the Christian Church. Its object is "to unite the Christian Pacifist Fellowships of the Churches in Great Britain with the cooperation of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and other Christian Pacifist bodies in fuller realization and in common and active testimony to the person and work of Jesus Christ, and the way of life which he proclaimed." Its co-chairman are Canon Raven and Henry Carter.

New Zealand

A letter from Mrs. O. E. Burton, wife of the President of the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society, contains the welcome news that her husband was to be released from prison in June. (The letter was dated April 27, 1944.) Mrs. Burton believes that the reduction of his sentence from two and one-half years to one year and eight months is due in large part to letters of Lord Ponsonby and others from England and of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick and others from the United States. Mr. Burton had been a soldier in World War I and was decorated by the British and French for conspicuous gallantry in battle. Thereafter, he became a pacifist, a teacher in Wesley College, and in 1935 a minister of the Methodist Church; but because of his determined advocacy of the pacifist faith he had been sentenced to imprisonment on six occasions, and in 1942 was expelled from the ministry of the Methodist Church. A fellow Methodist minister, Rev. Arthur Liversedge, of Christchurch, wrote of this action, "Burton was deprived of his ministerial status because he obeyed his Christ-controlled conscience, took up his cross, and followed his Lord into exile. There was no question of his sincerity, honesty, ability, brotherliness, tolerance, consistency or saintliness—for in all these things he excels."

According to a report in *The Friend* (London, May 26, 1944) there are between 700 and 800 "defaulters," mostly conscientious objectors, in the six New Zealand detention camps, as well as 30 in prison, mostly for the duration.

Communists Disrupt AFSC Institute

Beginning with a letter to the mayor of Seattle, charging that the Institute of International Relations, sponsored by the AFSC, was a "well-planned move to organize a defeatist 'Peace Now Movement,'" the Washington State Communist Political Association opened a smear campaign against the efforts of the local AFSC to better international understanding. On June 19, 20, and 21 hecklers were planted throughout the audience at the Plymouth Congregational Church, and at each session of the Institute their verbal attacks caused confusion and delay.

On June 19 Sgt. Frank Batterson, wounded veteran, was told that appeals for purchase of war bonds or for any cause were out of order in the meetings; but on the following night some of the hecklers insisted that Batterson speak, and instead of a short appeal for the bond drive, he delivered a twenty-minute address attacking the Institute and its speakers. The hecklers refused to be orderly, and several times tried to seize the platform. Police were present but had been requested by the Plymouth Church and the Institute not to intervene. The Seattle newspapers wrote up the incidents with marked sympathy for the Institute, and likened the tactics of the Communist hecklers to activities of the Nazis in pre-Hitler Germany. Local labor unions were said to be issuing resolutions against the Communist element.

NSBRO Decision

The poll of the National Council on the matter of withdrawal of the FOR from participation in the National Service Board for Religious Objectors resulted in a vote of 30 to 24 against withdrawal. This poll of the entire Council was taken by decision of the May meeting of the Council, and the results were announced at a meeting of the Executive Committee on July 18. Mimeographed statements of the arguments on both sides of the question, sent to all Council members to aid them in making their decisions, may be obtained by any FOR member who will send ten cents to cover the cost of mimeographing and mailing.

Smiley Sentenced

Glenn Smiley, FOR's Southwest Secretary, was sentenced on July 13 to a three-year term in the penitentiary, after a trial lasting three days. The FOR and its faith were really on trial, since several witnesses were called and cross-examined regarding the FOR philosophy and purpose. Among the witnesses were Alan Hunter, and Prof. Walter Muelder of the USC graduate school of religion. The testimony evidently was effective, for the District Attorney, who opened the case by asking that Smiley be given five years, finally recommended that he be given a three-year sentence, with ten days to consider accepting probation to a CPS camp. The Los Angeles FOR and the national office are arranging for the support of Mrs. Smiley and the three children.

New Associate Secretary

Par Danforth, director of Powell House in New York City, joined the staff of the FOR on July 15 as an associate secretary. Formerly an assignee at CPS Camp No. 12, Cooperstown, N. Y., Mr. Danforth has for the past three years been a member of the staff of the American Friends Service Committee's refugee division, first as placement counselor at Scattergood Hostel, West Branch, Iowa, and then in the refugee offices of the Committee both in Philadelphia and New York. Before going to CPS he was a member of the professional staff of the Boy Scouts of America for eleven years and at the time of his resignation was assistant director of public relations. As associate secretary of the Fellowship he will devote his attention largely to promotional and administrative duties.

Frenyear Resigns

Marion Frenyear, secretary of the New York City FOR, has offered her resignation, to take effect September 1. She has made a great contribution to FOR work in New York, having developed an extensive program of activities and an organization of 900 members with a budget of $3,000 a year. Serving also as secretary of the national FOR Refugee Committee, Miss Frenyear has aided many refugees to reach this country and to solve the problems of life in a strange land.

Guatemala Revolt

Perhaps taking a cue from the events which transpired in El Salvador early in May, Guatemalan students of the National University in Guatemala City began a general strike on June 25, which succeeded in ousting Jorge Ubico, iron-handed president since 1931. Very soon after President Martinez was forced to resign his office in El Salvador, the Ubico government took pains to prevent similar occurrences in their own country. Decrees were issued suspending some of the constitutional guarantees. Martial law was declared in the attempt to stem the ever-growing sentiment for restoration of freedom of press and speech. Despite these precautions to maintain his power, Jorge Ubico was faced with a general strike. Some of the strikers were killed by Ubico's efforts to stop the movement, but within five days it achieved success, and Ubico fled from the country on July 1.

Civil Liberties Not Impaired by War

In its annual review the American Civil Liberties Union recently said: " . . . it is evident that three years of war have not essentially impaired the guarantees of the Bill of Rights. . . ." They cite as evidence the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the Supreme Court decision on the Democratic primaries in the South, the extension of support for civil rights of the Mexican-American minority, and the growing public awareness of the evils of an expanding anti-Semitism. It is noted that although the anti-poll-tax bill failed, the Fair Employment Practice Committee received the support of Congress. The tragic blemish on the record is said to be the treatment of the Japanese-American population of the West Coast area, and the report says that "no possible redress can ever compensate for the tragic toll of human and material losses suffered by so many thousands of our fellow citizens."

FOR Fall Conferences

The annual conferences of the Fellowship of Reconciliation will be held as follows:

New York, September 22, 23, 24.
Chicago, Sep. 29, 30, and Oct. 1.
Nashville, October 6, 7, 8.
Denver, October 6, 7, 8.
Seattle, October 13, 14, 15.
San Francisco, October 20, 21, 22.
Los Angeles, October 27, 28, 29.

Among the topics to be discussed will be: conscription, labor, race relations, colonial problems, pacifism and the arts, and rural problems.

Labor Shortage?

On June 29th Darlington Hoopes, socialist candidate for vice-president, charged that governmental statistics on labor shortages were highly doubtful, because "deliberately slanted to justify labor regimentation under the priority referral plan." Hoopes said: "Actually there will very probably be a labor surplus because of continued cutbacks and the decline in war production."

Mental Crack-ups

Last month at the centenary meeting of the American Psychiatric Society, in Philadelphia, some alarming figures were reported: Selective Service rejects about 12 per cent of the men for neuropsychiatric disorders. This comprises approximately 35 per cent of all rejectees. Of the half million men discharged from the army for medical reasons, over 40 per cent, or 216,000, were discharged on neuropsychiatric grounds. It was further stated that the rate of mental crack-ups goes up in direct proportion to the time spent in combat zones.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Artists in CPS

One of the sad things about our period is that it finds the artistic imagination, on the whole, very poorly prepared to meet any profound moral crisis. Artists and writers have for decades been drifting away from any certain faith, and so have floated with the tides of events. A *Farewell to Arms* is followed after a while by a violent return to arms in *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* and a disillusioned *Idiot's Delight* is soon overtaken by a romantic *There Shall Be No Night*—and even *that* has to change its national setting over the week-end to keep up with the turn of events!

On the other side, spiritual faith has been sadly lacking in aesthetic imagination. There is little religious literature you can mention over the last half century or more which has ventured out on the great sea of living sensuous reality, where the great believing poets and prophets have never hesitated to go—a Hosea, Dante, Milton, Herbert, Wordsworth, Emerson, or Emily Dickinson.

In a recent visit to CPS camps I found artists and writers tucked away here and there, acting as night watchmen, or serving in kitchen or laundry, trying to keep a little niche safe for their flame! For total war and conscription are equally threatening to the religious and the aesthetic light. The two really need each other, and have always reached their highest pitch together, as in Bach, El Greco, David, Whitman. CPS is providing a small testing ground and laboratory for this needed reconciliation.

Little mimeographed sheets, more or less legible, have emerged somehow from the various units: *New Horizons, Calumet, Seed, The Illiterati, Pocomoke Opinion, Pacifica Views, The Sphere, Rhythm,* and so on—what a long list there really is! They publish the gripes, devotions, burlesques, sketches, records, personalities, profound social analyses, thoughts and fancies of the men, and occasionally some piece of real feeling and lasting worth. Artists have managed to paint pictures in spare time, and the Friends have sponsored a traveling exhibit of merit. There have been dramatic and musical efforts. This is all to the good.

Now at Waldport, Oregon, a Fine Arts Camp is getting under way, an admirable project sponsored by the Brethren. The magazine *The Compass,* which has been lucky enough to get the blessing of the ruling powers, expects to come out more or less regularly there, along with other literary and artistic efforts.

The current "Literary and Art Issue" of *The Compass* is worth notice. Martin Ponch and the other editors have wisely made artistic merit and content the main criterions of selection, subordinating mere ideological position. Art is long, and also broad, while ideology is too often short and narrow! The result is an issue of interesting variety with a good standard of excellence. It contains sketches, articles, stories, poetry, humor, a song, reviews, illustrations, and photo-reproductions. The graphic matter is good, and contributes very much to the magazine.

I found memorable, among other things, social sketches by J. F. Powers, John M. Gessell, and Arthur S. Harris; an article on Germany in the twenties by Paul-Kurt Ackerman; poems by Martin Ponch, Lloyd Frankenburg, and Kieth Billman, and a fine translation of a Rilke poem by Howard R. Houston. Two contributions, in my opinion, are outstanding and of lasting merit, both poetry: "No, Not Ever, in No Time," by William Everson and "Waterville Valley," by Jacob Sloan. Mr. Everson's poem is a little mannered and over-mental in expression, but its thought strikes very deep—reaches indeed one of the great insights of ethical truth. "Waterville Valley" has the concreteness and truth, the metaphorical and emotional unity, of the real artist's sensibility. Its thought and idealism are there, but implicit—too rare a thing, I am sorry to say, in pacifist expression. Both of these poems are fine instances of the effort that is going on, under the stress of conscience, to bring moral and aesthetic realities closer together.

FERNER NUHN.

Race and Sex

Strange Fruit. A novel by Lillian Smith, Reynal and Hitchcock, 1944. 314 pp. (Eighth Printing.) $2.75.

This novel, which has become one of the "sensations" of the season, is a study of a tragic love affair between a white man and a Negro girl in a small Georgia town. It is also a searching and bold analysis of the complex social and psychological interrelations of black-town and white-town in a Southern community.

The love affair is portrayed as a *romantic* love affair—a real affinity between two people. Such an approach strikes close to the center of the Anglo-Saxon moral code. Miss Smith has succeeded to a considerable degree in making the reader feel that Nonnie Anderson and Tracy Deen are actually in love on this plane.

Tracy was in the First World War, and the novel has its setting in those years following the war, which had caused such a breaking up of economic, racial, and geographical patterns. Nonnie is a college graduate, and of a family that has felt the impact of the northern migration of Negroes. In choosing this background, Miss Smith is anticipating, I think, the even more changing and perhaps critical situation in race relations that is likely to follow the present war.

Miss Smith writes in a free modern manner, with much speed and color. Her interest, however, is more that of a sociologist than a novelist, and in the end I should say that her book has lost sight of the more intimate personal values with which it begins. Its object is rather to anatomize the community in order to fix the responsibility for racial conflict in general. In this effort, Miss Smith is just and measured. She draws both her white and her black characters as individuals and human beings, with much knowledge of both groups and in a great variety of types. She distributes blame and merit on individuals rather than upon set classes, groups, or blocs.

If there is a weakness in Miss Smith's sense of values, I should say it lies in somewhat over-rating sexual expression as a virtue in itself. There is a tendency to associate mere readiness to make love with a good heart, and to connect any restraint with a mean and probably psychopathic personality. The one complete "villain" in the book—Mrs. Deen—is of this latter species, and the author has made her a kind of monstrosity of a wife and mother. It seems possible, too, that Miss Smith has over-done the hypocrisy and general reactionary character of church-going in a Southern community.

Strange Fruit is not a work of art as, for instance, Willa Cather's *Sapphira and the Slave Girl.* It is a brave and telling social study of a very great problem—the more brave and telling in that its author is herself a Southern woman who lives and works in the state where she has placed her story.

FERNER NUHN.

Peace Through Cooperation. By J. Henry Carpenter. Harper & Bros. 1944. 113 pp. $1.25.

The author, now executive secretary of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, was converted to the idea of cooperation in 1936 and since then has studied the movement in 19 countries. He visited China and India last year. In this little book he discusses cooperation in relation to world peace in a way that makes it a splendid primer for those who want a bird's-eye view of the world-wide effort to express the cooperative ideal in concrete organization and experimentation.

J. N. S.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

Pro and Con

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Though I realize that the Council will have acted one way or another regarding our relationship with the National Service Board before this communication can appear in *Fellowship,* I want very much to use that medium to make known to our membership at large my personal attitude and feeling in the matter. Since I have been for some years the representative of the Fellowship of Reconciliation on the National Service Board, it is perhaps fitting that I should thus express myself.

I am convinced that the fundamental point at issue is whether or not it is permissible in conscience to accept conscription. I can well understand the position of those who definitely identify conscription with the war system and who, therefore, refuse to register, or by any other action to give it their sanction. I happen to be among those who feel that in a democratic society conscription may at times be a necessary method of meeting a crisis. I therefore do not object to conscription, as such, provided I am permitted to undertake alternative civilian service as conscience dictates. It seems to me that all who have registered have by that action yielded to conscription. Their opposition to Civilian Public Service because it is conscriptive seems to me a basic inconsistency. I also incline to believe that much of the opposition among men in camp is due to their failure to recognize that in registering they accepted conscription.

As a Council member I cast my vote for a continuation of the relationship between the FOR and NSBRO because within the limitations set by conscription it seems to me a more effective way than any other which has been devised or suggested to meet the needs of those conscientious objectors who, like me, find themselves able to submit to registration. I believe, on the basis of my contacts with the National Service Board and with many men in CPS camps across the country, that NSBRO has secured, and is continuing to secure, more gains for pacifism and pacifists than could otherwise have been secured. I am convinced that the noise of criticism, both from campers and others, is out of all proportion to its significance, both numerically and ethically, and that were the FOR to withdraw from membership in the National Service Board it would, in effect, remove much of its help and influence from campers desirous of, and deserving, its continued support. If it be true that our continued membership in NSB in some measure commits all of us to its moral support, so also is it true that our formal withdrawal would identify us all with those who oppose it.

I am convinced that whatever our judgment as to our attitude toward conscription, and so toward the National Service Board, we share a common faith strong and enduring enough to prevent any break in the bond of our fellowship. Relativist and Absolutist have long confronted similar issues and have refused to be separated by them.

ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR.

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

My friend, John Haynes Holmes, as he has stated a number of times, expresses his personal views and not those of *Fellowship* in his monthly column, "From My Standpoint." In this letter I am making a personal comment on Holmes' column in the July issue.

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

In the first place, I question his presentation and estimate of the facts as to treatment of COs in this war. The Selective Service Act is an improvement over the law in the last war in that a CO does not now have to be a member of a pacifist sect to be entitled to alternative service. But pacifist recommendations were certainly not adopted "to an *astonishing* extent." We asked for the provisions of the British Act—and why should the United States be less just and liberal than the British, who were under constant bombardment? But no provision exempting those who cannot conscientiously accept any compulsory service was adopted here. Furthermore, alternative service was limited to those who were COs on "grounds of *religious* training and belief." As a result, scores of COs are in jail (grand total COs who have been or are in prison is at least 3,000), though draft boards and often judges have declared they were undoubtedly sincere conscientious objectors to all wars, because they are regarded as not "religious." Personally, it would be impossible for me on the ground that I was considered "religious" to accept "freedom" and to do conscript service for such a government. What I understand by "religion" would rather under such circumstances lead to Thoreau's reflection: "Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also in prison."

Dr. Holmes repeatedly uses the term "the government" where it is obviously synonymous with the administration. He holds that it has given impressive evidence of "intelligence and good will." As to intelligence, he points out that the administration was well aware that its main business under the law was to "raise an army and to fight a war." Is it not likely that the intelligence it has exhibited in dealing with COs has been directed precisely to this purpose, i.e., to prevent them from interfering in any way with the conduct of the war? What evidence is there that intelligence of another order has been used in dealing with COs? As for "good will," contrary to practice in Britain and Canada, COs in this country are forced to work without pay, thousands of them actually have to provide their own maintenance or have it paid by private agencies, several hundred thousand dollars in wages actually earned by COs in farm work has been taken from them and cannot even be used to keep their dependents, for whom no provision whatever as yet exists, from want.

To cite another instance, the Selective Service Act provides a special parole for offenders against the Act and there is an Executive Order 8641 which presumably gives the Selective Service Administration and the Department of Justice power to provide such paroles. But conditions offered are far from satisfactory, so that only 531 COs have applied for such parole. Only 34 have been granted parole for "special service" as in mental hospitals. It is, in other words, virtually impossible to get parole under this plan except to the Army or a CPS camp, in spite of the hue and cry about manpower shortage.

In the second place, I disagree with what seems to be Holmes' conception of the role of pacifists in war-time. He advocates winning "the ever-increasing friendship of the government by our never-failing friendship for the government." If he means an attitude of forgiveness, love, freedom from self-righteousness toward the men and women who compose the administration, by all means. That is our Christian and pacifist duty toward all men, including all our enemies. But he is speaking of policy, i.e., in political terms. Now the duty not to displease or irritate people does not lead us to take part in war which is the chief thing the government wants from us. Neither need this duty lead to acquiescence in the persecution of COs, for example. What makes Holmes think that in this political sense an administration which knows that its business is fighting a war will be friendly to pacifists, save as they help it win the war? And how can we at one and the same time be pacifists and show "friendship" by making it easier for an administration to wage war? True, our opposition can make use only of weapons of the spirit, but Holmes almost makes it sound as if, war having been decided on, the government is acting rightly, and any one who protests is a gratuitous trouble-maker!

The life of the religious pacifists necessarily revolves around two poles: cooperation and non-cooperation, service to human need, and refusal to aid, abet, or condone that which destroys life. Different people will tend to emphasize one pole or the other. No doubt those who are inclined to take the way of "protest" are subject to certain temptations and some of them have been ill-tempered and bitter—like many prophets who are nevertheless held in high esteem. But are there not also temptations peculiar to those who take the way of "cooperation?"

I do not believe that anyone who has any extensive first-hand acquaintance with prisons and CPS camps and projects and the COs in the one and the other will contend that cases of "unhappiness, disaffection, and recalcitrancy" are confined to one or the other; or, contrariwise, that "a religion of patience, forgiveness, love, and inextinguishable faith in God and man" is confined to one or the other group.

In some cases where we differ in our form of witness, both forms may be right and necessary. There are certain issues where in an objective sense both sides cannot be right; each must accordingly believe that he is right and the other wrong, and faithfully seek to win the other to his viewpoint, just as we seek to win fellow-Christians, e.g., to pacifism. But even then no one need regard himself as more *righteous* than the other. Fortunately the Fellowship makes room for varied forms of witness. Fortunately, also, freedom of expression prevails in it, so that it is possible for us to become aware of and to renounce errors, to grow in grace and truth. The only means for advancing moral and spiritual truth and winning others to it are clarity in thinking, integrity and purity of life, and humility of spirit. May none of us in the Fellowship be tempted to resort to other, impure means. That would indeed destroy fellowship and it would not make the truth prevail.

A. J. MUSTE.

What Are YOU Doing—

to help young people think straight?

EVERY FOR member ought in some way to be helping young people to think their way through the world's present confusion. If you are a minister, director of religious education, high-school or Sunday-school teacher, leader or counselor of a youth group, you should know that the

Forerunners Studybooks

will help you help your young people

1. **Pattern for Peacemakers** By R. Alfred Hassler $ .25
2. **New Wars for Old** By Frank Olmstead .25
3. **Exit Empire** By Vernon Nash .25
4. **The Next Peace** By R. Alfred Hassler .25

Others in the series will be published soon. Those listed here may be ordered on free 10-day approval if you wish. Send for them now. If you are not working with young people, you ought to be. Why not organize a local Forerunners group in your community? For information write to Miss Margaret Ann Osborn, Secretary, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

A "BARGAIN-BASEMENT" SPECIAL!

Below are listed the titles of a dozen pamphlets that ought to be in the library of any person interested in the problems of peace. All of them deal with timely topics. If you have read them yourself, we suggest that you order one or more sets on this special combination offer and give them to friends and prospective FOR members.

The Relevance of an Impossible Ideal $ .20
Macgregor's answer to the views of Reinhold Niebuhr.

Conscripts of Conscience .25
Hassler's story of 16 non-registrants.

Six Pillars of Peace .20
By the Federal Council's Commission on a just and durable peace.

How Jesus Faced Totalitarianism .15
Reprinted from Kirby Page's *Living Prayerfully.*

Federal Convicts No. 1128 and No. 1129 .15
Why two college boys went to prison.

The World Task of Pacifism .10
A Pendle Hill pamphlet written by A. J. Muste.

Pacifist Living Today and Tomorrow .15
Pendle Hill pamphlet on pacifism now and after the war.

New Nations for Old .25
Kenneth Boulding's discussion of world organization.

Wage Peace Now .15
A. J. Muste's plea for creative peace.

Shall We Rule Germany? .10
Oswald Garrison Villard's comprehensive article.

Selections from "War Without Violence" .15
Shridharani's interpretation of satyagraha.

Small Community Economics .25
By Arthur E. Morgan. Right up to date.

All 12 for $1.00—Save over ½ the regular price $2.10

Pamphlets for Peacemakers

Political Theories of Pacifism $ .25
Newest pamphlet of Pacifist Research Bureau. By Mulford Sibley.

War, Transition and Peace .15
Just out. Authoritative discussion of war and post-war problems.

Coercion of States: in Federal Unions .25
By Harrop Freeman and Theodore Paullin. Clear, factual study.

Coercion of States: in International Organizations .25
By Harrop Freeman. Unbiased examination of historical facts.

•

Don't Miss These NEW BOOKS

Say Yes to the Light! $1.50
Allan Hunter. A plea to take Jesus' teachings seriously. Harpers.

A Preface to Prayer 2.00
Gerald Heard. A great contribution to the understanding of prayer.

Living Abundantly 2.50
Kirby Page's latest volume of meditations. Farrar & Rinehart.

Peace Is the Victory 1.50
Impressive symposium by Fosdick, Holmes, Muste and many others.

•

For Your MUST List

Do You Know Labor? $2.00
By James Myers. Paper, $1.00

From Victory to Peace 1.50
By Paul Hutchinson. Willet, Clark & Co.

The Fall of Christianity 1.50
By Heering. Church, state, and war.

Brothers Under the Skin 3.00
By McWilliams. Problems of all races.

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.